	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary	10/734,532	SAILER ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	DAVID E. ENGLAND	2443	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) _DAVID E. ENGLAND_.   (3)_____.

(2) _Richard S. Yapchanyk_.   (4)_____.

Date of Interview: _29 May 2009_.

Type: a)☒ Telephonic   b)☐ Video Conference
      c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant   2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☒ Yes   e)☐ No.
   If Yes, brief description: _Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form_.

Claim(s) discussed: _12_.

Identification of prior art discussed: _Ref. A, (Deverill) and C, (Ploetz)_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☒ was reached.   g)☐ was not reached.   h)☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _See Continuation Sheet_.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/David E. England/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney Yapchanyk contacted the Examiner to discuss the prior art and how it is interpreted with regard to claim 12, Attorney's remarks stated in Interview Request Form. The Examiner stated to the first remark that, "as the code is being loaded" is relative to how the system is developed, i.e., some system consider this right when code enters the device and other would interpret this as the code enters the node and is sent to memory of sorts, i.e., cache, and then once the processor is free it would then look at the code. Examiner stated that the references teach these types of system and the Applicant's claims are broad enough to read on these types of systems. As for the remarks to reference C and that it does not teach changed and unchanged data at the same time, the Applicant was asked to view column 8 of Ploetz in which it teaches data tagged as ":old" and ":new", which reads on the claims. The Attorney stated that they are not stored in the same location and that the Applicant would amend to teach this limitation. Examiner followed by saying that if this is the direction the Applicant wishes to take, there should be more claim language that states how they might be stored in one database, i.e., indexing, labeling, and/ or retrieving. so as not to get an obviousness rejection back since combining two databases is well within ability of one skilled in the art. Examiner awaits Applicant's response..